

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/668,026	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JENNINGS, WILLIAM T.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christian La Forgia	<b>Art Unit</b> 2131	

**All Participants:**

(1) Christian La Forgia.

(2) Bradley Bowling (Reg. No. 52,641).

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 16 April 2007

**Time:** 10 am

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

6, 7, 33, 34

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed amending claim 6 to incorporate the claim language of claim 7 to be more consistent with the arguments presented by the Applicant in the Pre-Brief conference request. The Examiner also proposed moving the claim language from claim 34 into claim 33 for similar reasons. Mr. Bowling and his client agreed to the proposed Examiner's amendment.